

filed objected to the Report and Recommendation. Accordingly, PCIC is not entitled to *de novo* review by the District Judge of those findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and except upon grounds of plain error, PCIC is barred from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the Court. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Assoc.*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

Nonetheless, the Court has reviewed the pleadings in this case and the Report of the Magistrate Judge and agrees with the Report of the Magistrate Judge. *See United States v. Raddatz*, 447 U.S. 667, 683 (1980) (“[T]he statute permits the district court to give to the magistrate’s proposed findings of fact and recommendations ‘such weight as [their] merit commands and the sound discretion of the judge warrants’”) (quoting *Mathews v. Weber*, 23 U.S. 261, 275 (1976)).

The Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge as the findings and conclusions of this Court. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the Motion to Remand is **GRANTED**. The above-captioned case is hereby **REMANDED** to the 416th Judicial District Court of Collin County, Texas.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 30th day of January, 2020.


ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE